

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21 and 24-28 are pending in this application. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 11, 24, 26, and 27 are amended. A new claim 29 is added and no claims are cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-19, 21 and 24-29 are now pending. No new claims fees are due, since 28 claims were originally paid for and 25 claims will be pending upon entry of this paper.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 8-19, 21 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,165,226, Thurner et al. (hereinafter “Thurner”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,515,977, Eryurek et al. (hereinafter “Eryurek”). Claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thurner in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0132779, Gilbert et al. (hereinafter “Gilbert”).

Claim 1

Thurner and Eryurek, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 1 and therefore no combination of the cited references can anticipate claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For example, neither Thurner nor Eryurek discloses or suggests that an object entity representing a process plant element comprises a definition of graphics for a depiction of the process plant element via a user interface, wherein the definition of graphics is set forth in a declarative format. The Office Action suggests that this element of claim 1 is disclosed at col. 3, ln 43-47 of Thurner. The cited portion of Thurner is directed to a set of tools contained in a “workbench” and states that “an object designer provides graphical design of objects in a number of different views, including Tree, Table, XML, and HTML views.” In view of the cited portion of Thurner, declarative format (along with tree or table formats) in Thurner appears to be used for depiction of objects in an object designer tool, rather than for depictions of process plant elements included in objects representing the process plant elements. Accordingly, Thurner does not disclose or suggest “a first portion defining

graphics for a depiction of the process plant element via the user interface, wherein the first portion is set forth in a declarative format,” as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, claim 1 is amended and now recites that depiction of the process plant element that the object represents “is rendered dynamically based on data indicative of the online operation of the process element.” Neither Thurner nor Eryurek discloses or suggests this additional feature of the amended claim 1. Thurner generally discloses a computer system that “provides use of a display device, e.g., Browser or GUI, to couple several views of a manufacturing plant such that if a user navigates through one view, all coupled views adjust their focus accordingly.” (*see* Thurner, col 3, ll 59-62). Thurner does not disclose or suggest that depictions of elements of the manufacturing plant are rendered **dynamically** based on data indicative of online operation of the elements, or are rendered dynamically in any other manner. At most, Thurner discloses that a view using such depictions is dynamically re-focused based on a change in a different view of the system. Eryurek does not disclose or suggest dynamic rendering of process plant element depictions either. While Eryurek describes a template configuration object that includes a graphical representation of a physical entity within a process plant (*see* Abstract), there is nothing disclosed in Eryurek that suggests that the graphical representation is rendered dynamically based on data indicative of online operation of the physical entity within the process plant.

Thus, at least because neither of the cited reference discloses or suggests at least the above elements of claim 1, no combination of these reference can anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 26

Claim 11 is amended and now recites, in part, “generating commands specifying a data conversion routine for the graphic display element for converting data values from the data source for **dynamic rendering of a depiction of the process plant element based on the data values.**” Similarly, claim 26 is amended and now recites “a navigation portion identifying data sources for content to be displayed in connection with the graphics, wherein data indicative of the online operation of the process plant element is retrieved from the data sources when the graphics for the depiction of the process plant element are rendered for display via the user interface so that the depiction of the process plant element is **rendered**

dynamically based on the data indicative of online operation of the process plant element.”

As discussed above in connection to claim 1, neither Thurner nor Eryurek discloses or suggests dynamic rendering of depictions of process plant elements. Thus, each of claims 11 and 26 is allowable over the cited references at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection of claim 11 is respectfully requested.

Claim 24

Claim 24 is amended to recite, in part, “using an object defining a composite graphical element to create a plurality of instances thereof in respective process graphic displays to be depicted via the user interface, wherein the composite graphical element **is composed of vector graphic entities**” Claim 24 further recites “modifying the object defining the composite graphical element” and “propagating the modification to each of the plurality of instances of the composite graphical element.” Applicants respectfully submit that Thurner and Gilbert, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least this combination of elements of claim 24, as amended.

In particular, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests a composite graphical element composed of vector graphic entities. Thurner describes displaying various views of an industrial plant, but says nothing about the graphic nature of depiction of objects within such views. Specifically, Thurner does not disclose or suggest that such objects are composed of primitive vector graphic entities, as recited in claim 24, nor does Thurner disclose or suggest that depiction of such objects is based on vector graphics of any kind. Similarly, Gilbert does not disclose or suggest such composite graphical elements composed of vector graphic entities. Rather, graphical elements disclosed by Gilbert include visualizations that are based on “primitive shapes” such as circles and rectangles (*see* Gilbert at p. 9, par. 62). Such primitive shapes do not appear to be “vector graphic entities.” Rather, it appears that the primitive shapes of Gilbert are simply images of the corresponding shapes (e.g., circles and rectangles). There is nothing in Gilbert that discloses or suggests vector graphics or graphical elements composed of vector graphics. Accordingly, Gilbert does not disclose or suggest “using an object defining a composite graphical element to create a plurality of instances thereof in respective process graphic displays to be depicted via the user

interface, wherein the composite graphical element is composed of vector graphic entities,” as recited in the amended claims 24.

Thus, at least because neither Thurner nor Gilbert discloses or suggest using vector graphics to render depictions, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests composite graphical element composed of a vector graphic entities. Thus, no combination of the cited references anticipates claim 24, and therefore claim 24 is believed to allowable over the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-19, 21, 25, and 27-28

Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-19, 21, 25, and 27-28 are allowable at least because these claims depend from respective allowable claims, as discussed above. Further, at least some of these claims recite additional elements neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, and are allowable for this additional reason.

For example, claim 5 recites “wherein the declarative format comprises a vector graphics format for script defining the graphics.” The Action alleges that this limitation is disclosed at col 3, ln 50-55 of Thurner. The cited portion merely mentions that the workbench of Thurner provides “Script Editors which are accessed through the Tools interface Pane 24.” Thurner does not disclose or suggest that the script editors or scripts created using the script editors are in any way connected to a graphical representation of a process plant element. In general, there is nothing disclosed in Thurner that suggests vector graphics of any kind, much less “a declarative format that comprises a vector graphics format for script defining the graphics,” as recited in claim 5. Thus, claim 5 is allowable for this additional reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons Applicants submit that all of the remaining claims are now in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby given authorization to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 13-2855 of Marshall, Gerstein & Borun, LLP under Order No. 06005/41127.

Should the examiner wish to discuss any of the foregoing comments or any claim amendments deemed necessary to gain allowance, applicants kindly request that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney by telephone at the number provided below.

In view of the above, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 3, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Roger A. Heppermann #37,641/
Roger A. Heppermann
Registration No.: 37,641
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive
6300 Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant